	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/751,259	HEMBREE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Charles G. Freay	3746
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>per</u>	<u>ıding</u>
(1) <u>Charles G. Freay</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Joshua Randall</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 27 April 2006	Time: <u>12:30 pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: . 1 and 18		
Prior art documents discussed: Klein et al (USPN 5,641,275)		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	'Applicant's Representative Signature	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: After considering the applicant's argumenst with regards to a separate thrust ring in the March 3, 2006 amendment the examiner agreed that if the noted claims made clear that the thrust ring was a separate member then the claims would be favorably considered. The examiner prosed changes to claims 1 and 18 which included references to a containment shell hub, thus making clear that the claimed thrust ring was a separate element. The applicant agreed to the changes as set forth in the attached Examiner's Amendment.